

# The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Each volume contains twenty-six or twenty-seven issues.

Owner and Publisher, The Classical Association of the Atlantic States.  
Place of publication, Barnard College, New York, New York.  
Editor, Charles Knapp (Barnard College, Columbia University).  
Address, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York, New York.

VOLUME XXVIII, No. 15

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1935

WHOLE NO. 759

## SOME EPICUREANS AT ROME<sup>1</sup>

Lucretius, the chief Roman exponent of Epicureanism, addressed his treatise to C. Memmius<sup>1a</sup>, Catullus's profligate praetor. It appears that Memmius was not readily won over to the School, but, because he was an influential person, he would have been desirable for the School to own. He is further connected with Epicurean matters through his possession of Epicurus's former Garden at Athens; this had been granted to him by the Areopagus. He forthwith let it be known that he intended to clear away the historic ruins of Epicurus's house, and build a modern house on the site. This disturbed the Epicureans, especially Patro, Director of the Epicurean School at Athens from about the year 70 B. C. Patro had met Cicero in Rome, and a pleasant friendship ensued. Cicero bore with him in all things save philosophy: . . . Cum Patrone Epicurio mihi omnia sunt, nisi quod in philosophia vehementer ab eo dissentio<sup>1b</sup>. Patro complained to Cicero, then in Rome, about the reported purpose of Memmius. After arriving at Athens too late to find Memmius, who had the very day before of necessity departed for Mytilene, Cicero decided to write to him, asking that he be reconciled with Patro and turn over for the use of the School the historic Garden. Memmius had by this time given up his intention of building, but he was still at odds with Patro, as Cicero tells Atticus later<sup>2</sup>: Memmius autem aedificandi consilium abiecerat, sed erat Patroni iratus. Cicero may have acted out of respect for the memory of Phaedrus, Patro's predecessor, and one of Cicero's early teachers, for in his letter to Memmius he recalls how he knew Phaedrus before the year 88, and he characterizes him as *vir bonus et suavis et officiosus*, as well as *philosophus*. Elsewhere Cicero calls Phaedrus *philosophus nobilis*<sup>3</sup>, and says *Phaedro nihil elegantius, nihil humanius <est>*, but adds that he was not above a display of temper (*sed stomachabatur senex*<sup>4</sup>). In De Finibus 1.16 Cicero, speaking of the scope of his own training in Epicureanism, gives Phaedrus as one of his sources (nisi mihi Phaedrum mentitum . . . putas, . . . omnes mihi Epicuri sententiae satis notae sunt), and in

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read at the Twenty-sixth Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Barnard College, Columbia University, April 28-29, 1933.

<sup>1a</sup>Reference may be made here to an interesting and instructive paper, entitled Lucretius and Memmius, by Professor John Barker Stearns, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25.67-68. That paper discusses many of the points on which Professor Hall touches in the first part of his paper. C. K. >

<sup>1b</sup>Ad Familiares 13.1.2. <sup>2</sup>Ad Atticum 5.11.6.  
<sup>3</sup>Philippica 5.15. <sup>4</sup>De Natura Deorum 1.33.

De Finibus 5.3 he makes Atticus a dear friend of Phaedrus and has him remark that he has spent much time with Phaedrus in the Garden at Athens. It is amusing to note that, in retailing to Atticus the Patro-Memmius discord, Cicero lightly dubs Patro one of the 'block-heads', meaning Epicureans in general.

A man somewhat younger than Phaedrus, a man whose name is of considerable importance among philosophers at Rome, was Philodemus<sup>5a</sup>. Strabo<sup>6</sup> says that he was a native of Gadara. He was living in Rome in Cicero's day, for part of the time, at least, with Piso. Although Cicero reviles Piso as a 'fake' Epicurean, fashioned out of mud, originating in a hog-pen, he takes pains enough<sup>6</sup> to give due respect to Philodemus, his preceptor, noting the fact that Philodemus is remarkable among Epicureans in that he has paid much attention to literature, *quod fere ceteros Epicurios neglegere dicunt*. This view of the usual Epicurean shunning of culture is later expressed by Quintilian<sup>7</sup>: Epicurus qui fugere omnem disciplinam navigatione quam velocissima iubet. Philodemus, however, is said<sup>8</sup> to have written poetry *ita concinnum, ita elegans nihil ut fieri possit argutius*. Some two dozen examples of his poetic skill are extant, one<sup>9</sup> of which Professor Hendrickson<sup>9a</sup> has shown to be reflected in Horace, Carmina 1.38. That he was the accepted authority for Epicurean teaching is shown where Cicero makes Torquatus say, toward the close of the second book of the De Finibus<sup>10</sup>, 'I have in mind several to whom I might refer your arguments against Epicureanism, though I could do something about it myself; however, I prefer to find men still better equipped', and Cicero himself replies, *Familiares nostros, credo, Sironem dicis et Philodemum*.

Associated with Philodemus here is Siro. Elsewhere Cicero<sup>11</sup>, speaking of memory and its relation to objects of perception, says, *omnia meminit Siron Epicuri dogmata*. In a letter to Trebianus<sup>12</sup> Cicero calls Siro a friend. According to Donatus<sup>13</sup> and Servius<sup>14</sup>, Siro was

<sup>1a</sup>In the course of a paper entitled Gadarenes in Pagan Literature, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 25.25-30, Dr. Moses Hadas discussed Philodemus (29 A-30 A). In footnotes he gave many references to ancient passages which relate to Philodemus, and also to modern discussions of Philodemus and his works. C. K. >

<sup>1b</sup>16.2.29. <sup>2</sup>In Pisonem 28-29. <sup>3</sup>12.2.24. See also 2.17.16.

<sup>4</sup>Cicero, In Pisonem 28-29. <sup>5</sup>Anthologia Palatina 11.34.

<sup>5a</sup>See George L. Hendrickson, An Epigram of Philodemus and Two Latin Congeners, The American Journal of Philology 39 (1918), 27-43, especially 32-41.

<sup>6</sup>192.119. <sup>7</sup>Academica 2.106.

<sup>8</sup>Vita Vergili 79. <sup>9</sup>Ad Familiares 6.11.2.

<sup>9a</sup>On Eclogues 6.13, Aeneid 6.264.

a teacher of Vergil. Further evidence to that effect appears in Catalepton 5<sup>14a</sup>,

nos ad beata vela mittimus portus,  
magni petentes docta dicta Sironis,

and Catalepton 8,

Villula, quae Sironis eras, et pauper agelle,  
—verum illi domino tu quoque divitiae—,  
me tibi et hos una mecum quos semper amavi  
(si quid de patria tristius audiero)  
commendo in primisque patrem. Tu nunc eris illi  
Mantua quod fuerat, quodque Cremona prius.

In the fragment of the work *Περὶ Κολακέλας*, found in a papyrus from Herculaneum, there appears to be a catalogue of names of members of the Epicurean School near Naples<sup>15</sup>:

<<sup>14a</sup> I do not think that any one should quote any part of the Appendix Vergiliiana as authority for an incident of Vergil's life without indicating that scholars are not yet agreed with respect to the question whether Vergil did—or did not—write those pieces (see my remarks in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28.43, notes 21, 27, 29, 30, 46, notes 37, 39, 48, note 52). When I raised this point with Professor Hall, he replied, "These two passages from the Catalepton were accepted as Vergilian years ago by those who did not then acknowledge other portions of the Vergilian Appendix... in this instance to append such a note as you suggest would not be edifying at all. Note that I have altered the numbers <of these two pieces in the Catalepton> to conform to the editions of Vollmer and of R. Ellis".

Writers are far too much afraid to give certain information. They fear, forsooth, that some of their colleagues will regard the giving of such information as beneath the dignity of a scholar. Nothing is beneath the dignity of a scholar that helps a reader to understand, quickly and in full, and to check the scholar's statements.

No one knows everything. A writer should at all times be considerate of his readers. He should save their time by giving exact information about books, articles, etc. which he mentions. He should avoid, as he would a contagious disease, cabalistic abbreviations of titles which must, many of them, be mysterious to his readers. A man who happens to be working at a given period on certain things will have, at least for the time being, exact information about certain matters, e. g. the meaning of certain abbreviations, titles of books and periodicals, or of certain books and articles, such as Ellis's and Vollmer's editions of the text of the Catalepton. Another student, busy with some other subject, may not have, at the moment, *that* information, and so he will be grateful for it.

My own collection of classical books, periodicals, reprints is, I suspect, one of the best private classical libraries in the United States of America. With the help of the ten thousand or more cards in the catalogue of that library and the books and articles to which they give me access, I have, in the last twenty-seven years, supplied in articles and in reviews that appeared in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY data about books and articles of which no hint appeared in the articles or the reviews as they came into my hands. From that source, verified by examination of the books themselves, I note here that Robinson Ellis's edition of the text of the Appendix Vergiliiana appeared in 1907 as a volume of the Oxford Classical Text Series. There is no date on the title-page; the Praefatio is dated in March, 1907. Friedrich Vollmer's edition of the text of the Appendix Vergiliiana, etc., appeared in Volume 1 of his revision of Emil Baehrens's edition of the Poetæ Latini Minores (Leipzig, 1910).

Has every High School teacher of Latin a copy of each of these books? Has every College teacher, every University teacher of Latin a copy of each of them?

Finally, in connection with the Catalepton I note that one might (should) mention an important work, Theodor Birt, Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie Vergils: Erklärung des Catalepton (Leipzig, Teubner, 1910), precisely because this is, so far as I know, the only complete (modern) commentary on the Catalepton. See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 28.45, note 36.

Many a time, when I have asked an author of article or review to expand an abbreviation of the title of some article, or, more often, of a periodical, or to give me the Christian name or names of an author to whose work he was referring, or to give data about publishers, place and time of publication, he was unable to do so. He had used the book in some particular library. He had failed to make full notes at the time on these points, all of them of prime importance. He could not, at the moment of my query, get access to the book, because it was at some distant point. A writer so situated finds it easy, in self-defense, to characterize data of this sort as unimportant. They are, I repeat, of prime importance. Every author should have consideration for others, and should give fullest information on the points I mention above, and others kindred to them. A young scholar happened very recently to bewail to me his experiences. Documentation of book after book, article after article, he said, was atrocious. Even a scholar of high reputation, he has found, will quote something, without giving specific reference. A later writer will quote the earlier. Of course he cannot give the reference; of course he is taking his material at second-hand with no attempt at verification. Is this scholarship, in any sense of that term? C. K. >

<sup>14</sup>See A. Körte, Augusteum bei Philodem, Rheinisches Museum 45 (1890), 172–177.

οι μεν καταλλα  
σεις φιλοσοφησαν  
και ουαριε και ου  
κοιντιλιε καδαπ  
περι φθονου καιπε....

Similarly, in Philodemus's *Περὶ Φιλαργυρίας*, at the beginning, we find this:

π λαργυρι  
· · · · ·  
τιε και ουαρι  
και Κοιντιλι....

In each case the names *Varius* and *Quintilius* are spelled out entirely in the vocative case. One might write after *ου* in verse 3 of the first quotation *εργιλε*, and before *τιε* in the second *Ορα* or *Πλω*. The passage thus 'restored' would bear out Probus<sup>16</sup>: Vixit <Ver-gilius> pluribus annis liberali in o'io, secutus Epuci sectam insigni concordia, et familiaritate usus Quintili, Tuccae, et Vari. We may suppose 'Varius' to be L. Varius Rufus, epic and tragic poet, and, in collaboration with Plotius Tucca, editor of the Aeneid. Of him Horace writes<sup>17</sup>: forte epos acer ut nemo Varius ducit. 'Quintilius' is, we may assume, Quintilius Varus of Cremona, literary critic, whose death in the year 24 was mourned by both Vergil and Horace<sup>18</sup>. In his lifetime, says Horace<sup>19</sup>, Quintilio si quid recitares, "Corrigere, sodes, hoc", aiebat, "et hoc" . . . .

The case of Horace was one, by no means unique, where a youthful tendency toward epicureanism was succeeded by a leaning toward eclecticism. Zeller says<sup>20</sup> of Horace, "... Horace . . . was no Epicurean, but only a man who gathered everywhere what he could make use of . . ." He says this in the face of Horace's offer of entertainment to Tibullus when he promises to appear before him as a stout, sleek exponent of Epicurus<sup>21</sup>, and of his assertion<sup>22</sup> that he is a stranger to superstition (namque deos didici securum agere aevum nec si quid miri faciat natura deos id tristis ex alto caeli dimittere tecto). Surely the orthodox view is saner, that in the Sermones, as Professor Hendrickson says<sup>23</sup>, Horace is frankly Epicurean. The passage cited above from Horace, Sermones 1. 5. 101–103, should beyond doubt be interpreted, with Wickham, as meaning, 'I am one of those of whom Lucretius speaks, who have learned his lesson', for the verses of Horace have been transplanted almost bodily from Lucretius 5.83–85, 6.58–60,

nam bene qui didicere deos securum agere aevum,  
si tamen interea mirantur qua ratione  
quaequi geri possint . . . .

An Epicurean of some notoriety was Titus Albutius, who, according to Cicero<sup>24</sup>, was educated by the Greeks, while he was a young man at Athens, to such a degree as almost to have become a Greek. He left Athens a perfect Epicurean, *minime aptum ad dicendum genus*. After conviction for extortion practised while he was propraetor of Sardinia, he sojourned in exile at Athens.

<sup>16</sup>Vita Vergilii 1. <sup>17</sup>Sermones 1.10.43–44.

<sup>18</sup>Horace, Carmina 1.24. <sup>19</sup>See Horace, Ars Poetica 438–439.

<sup>20</sup>See Eduard Zeller, Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics, Translated, <from the German>, by Oswald J. Reichel<sup>21</sup>, 416, note 1 (London, Longmans, 1892).

<sup>21</sup>Epistulae 1. 4.15.

<sup>22</sup>See page 36 of the article mentioned in note 9a, above.

<sup>23</sup>Brutus 131.

employing his time by 'philosophizing with equanimity'<sup>26</sup>.

C. Velleius of Lanuvium figures in the *De Natura Deorum* in the triangular debate between himself, representing the Epicureans, Q. Lucilius Balbus, representing the Stoics, and C. Aurelius Cotta, representing the Academics. Cicero hears the discussion, and pretends to favor the cause of the Stoics, though in reality Cotta's arguments present Cicero's own views.

C. Catius is mentioned by Cicero in a letter to Cassius, *& propos* the thought that Cicero, in writing to Cassius, a lax correspondent, had the sensation of seeing him face to face, by the impinging of external images, 'as your new friends say, for in case you do not know what I am talking about, Catius the Insubrian, who has just recently died, called *εἰδωλα σπέρτα*'<sup>27</sup>. This Catius was the author of a popular work on matters Epicurean, according to Quintilian<sup>28</sup>; he was *levis sed non iniucundus auctor*, superficial in his treatment, but easily read. In an earlier letter to Cassius, Cicero writes<sup>29</sup>: 'Perhaps you ask where philosophy exists. Yours dwells in the kitchen, mine in the *palaestra*'. When Cassius replies to Cicero concerning the 'specters' of Catius, he takes occasion to defend pure Epicureanism, asserting that, while it is by no means easy to convince men in advance of the truth of the rival Stoic tenet, *τὸν καλὸν διὰ αὐτὸν αλερόν*, a good man must inevitably experience pleasure and freedom from envy as a result of his virtuous conduct; 'for example', he says, 'Pansa, although aiming at pleasure, never lost his grasp on exemplary, virtuous, conduct'. Here he quotes a dictum of the master, Epicurus (*οὐκ ἔστιν ηὔτες ἀνεύ τοῦ καλῶς καὶ δυκαλῶς ξῆρις*) and then takes a fling<sup>30</sup> at both Catius and Amafinius as being members of a class of self-styled Epicureans, but in reality *mali verborum <Eplicuri> interpretes*. Amafinius had written some loosely executed, but none the less popular, books on Epicureanism. Pansa seems to have been successful on occasion in winning proselytes; at least Cicero asks Trebatius to confirm the report that Pansa had initiated him as an Epicurean. He feels put out about it, but stands ready to excuse Trebatius if the move was a matter of policy intended to humor Pansa<sup>31</sup>.

No matter how ideal is the discussion set forth in the first book of the *De Finibus*, L. Manlius Torquatus must undoubtedly have been a fit character to carry the task imposed upon him of expounding and defending Epicurean teaching, and must have deserved fully the title, *homo omni doctrina eruditus*.

T. Pomponius Atticus had been a pupil of both Zeno and Phaedrus, and hence he speaks<sup>32</sup> of members of the Epicurean School as *condiscipuli*. At the beginning of the fifth book of the *De Finibus*, where he and Cicero are supposed to be walking past Epicurus's Garden in Athens, Atticus reminds Cicero that he could not forget Epicurus's appearance if he would, for all the members of the School made it a practice to carry his likeness with them, not only in pictures, but

even on drinking cups and on rings. Atticus's entire life was a definite putting into practice of the *μὴ πολτρεῖσθαι* of Epicurus<sup>33</sup>. There is a notable consonance between the opening lines of the second book of Lucretius, where the Epicurean observer, aloof from political turmoil, watches the tribulations of the benighted as they are tossed about as if on the treacherous waves, and Nepos, Atticus 6, *In re publica ita <Atticus> est versatus ut semper optimarum partium et esset et existimaretur, neque tamen se civilibus fluctibus committeret, quod non magis eos in sua potestate existimabat qui se iis dedissent quam qui maritimis iacerentur. Honores non petiti*. It is evident, however, that Atticus was not enveloped in a hard impermeable shell of bigotry, for he was able to appreciate the *Tusculanae Disputationes* and the *De Re Publica*, and he showed a traditionally non-Epicurean liberal culture, since he was *omni liberali doctrina politissimus*. His instructors stood ever high in his thoughts: *valde diligit Patronem, valde Phaedrum amavit*<sup>34</sup>.

M. Fadius Gallus, one of Cicero's correspondents, is set down by Cicero<sup>35</sup> as an Epicurean. Cicero is describing to Gallus what seems to be an attack of dysentery, from which he is trying to recover, and he then remarks that the Stoics disapprove of 'your Epicurus' because they think that this illness is the result of gluttony. A fragment of Epicurus preserved in Diogenes Laertius<sup>36</sup> would seem to show that Epicurus suffered from this very malady.

M. Pompilius Andronicus was a recruit to the ranks of philosophers from the profession of grammarian. He was a Syrian by birth, but established himself at Rome. When he noticed that his prestige was waning and that he was classified as a second-rater, inferior to Antonius Gniphon, one of Caesar's instructors, he removed to Cumae, where he lived at ease, composing much unsaleable material. He became so poor that he was forced to sell his annotated copy of Ennius's *Annales* for 16,000 *nummi*<sup>37</sup>. Here was one very definite case where the calling of a materialistic philosopher was not materially profitable.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,  
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY

CLAYTON M. HALL

### THE STOIC CREED ON THE ORIGIN OF KINGSHIP AND OF LAWS<sup>1</sup>

Cicero, in *De Officiis*, Book 2, Chapter 12, Sections 41–42, writes thus on the origin of the kingship, its nature, and its function (I give the passage in the version by Professor Walter Miller [The Loeb Classical Library, 1913: see pages 209, 211]):

Now it seems to me, at least, that not only among the Medes, as Herodotus tells us, but also among our own ancestors, men of high moral character were made kings in order that the people might enjoy justice. For, as the masses in their helplessness were oppressed by

<sup>26</sup>Cicero, *Tusculanae Disputationes* 5.108.

<sup>27</sup>Ad *Familiares* 16.16.1. <sup>28</sup>10.1.24.

<sup>29</sup>Ad *Familiares* 15.18.1. <sup>30</sup>Ad *Familiares* 15.19.1–3.

<sup>31</sup>Ad *Familiares* 7.12, *passim*. <sup>32</sup>De *Legibus* 1.21.

<sup>33</sup>Cicero, *Ad Atticum* 14.20.5. <sup>34</sup>Ad *Familiares* 1.3.1.5.

<sup>35</sup>Ad *Familiares* 7.26.1. <sup>36</sup>10.22.

<sup>37</sup>Suetonius, *De Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* 8.

<sup>1</sup>The subject and the general problem of this paper were suggested to me by the late Professor Clifford H. Moore, of Harvard University. I have drawn also from my notes of lectures on Epicureanism that were delivered at Harvard University, in 1927, by an English scholar, Professor Ernest E. Sikes.

the strong, they appealed for protection to some one man who was conspicuous for his virtue; and as he shielded the weaker classes from wrong, he managed by establishing equitable conditions to hold the higher and the lower classes in an equality of right. The reason for making constitutional laws was the same as that for making kings. For what people have always sought is equality of rights before the law. For rights that were not open to all alike would be no rights. If the people secured their end at the hands of one just and good man, they were satisfied with that; but when such was not their good fortune, laws were invented, to speak to all men at all times in one and the same voice.

This, then, is obvious: nations used to select for their rulers those men whose reputation for justice was high in the eyes of the people. If in addition they were also thought wise, there was nothing that men did not think they could secure under such leadership. Justice is, therefore, in every way to be cultivated and maintained, both for its own sake (for otherwise it would not be justice) and for the enhancement of personal honour and glory.

On this subject of the origin of the kingship and of laws the Stoics and the Epicureans had joined, before Cicero's day, issue with each other. All traits of Epicurean anthropology lead back to Lucretius (5. 925-1457); very little on this subject survives among the fragments of Epicurus. For the Stoic creed there is no single extant source. Along with most religions Stoicism postulates a creator, or else a divine or heroic culture-giver, and a Golden Age, since it is difficult to suppose that an *imperfect* world would come from the hands of a creator or a heroic culture-giver. Prometheus, Hephaestus, and Hercules all had a part in the civilization of man. Decadence and sin, therefore, represent the fall from the Golden Age, a conception as old as Hesiod.

I propose to consider now (1) the evolution of kingship and laws; (2) the nature of kingship; and (3) the nature of laws<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Epicurean orthodoxy on the subject of this paper represents a distinct rationalistic protest against the theory of the Golden Age, and goes back in spirit to the sophists, and ultimately to Xenophanes. A fragment of the Sisyphus of Critias (August Nauck, *Tragorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 771 (Leipzig, Teubner [1926])) says that man's life was once untrammeled in the fashion of the beasts; man was then a slave to force, and there was no prize for the good, no punishment for the bad. Presently punitive laws were established, that justice might rule and that wanton violence might be checked. Fines followed upon misdemeanors, but, when the laws failed to prevent crime (now committed in secret), some sagacious and clever man, in order to inspire fear in the wicked, developed the idea that the gods had cognizance of these matters. Then, as a further deterrent, the gods were associated with thunder and lightning. Epicurus, too, opposed the theory of the fall of man, held by Hesiod and the Stoics; he believed in man's progression, and in a natural rise, after spontaneous generation from the earth, from the life of the beasts to the present state of man. In all this man was in no way aided by the gods (see Lucretius 5.791-796, 925-957). Primitive men could not look to the common good, and knew not how to make common use of customs and laws (Lucretius 5.958-959). Men of outstanding talent and understanding began, by means of new inventions and fire, to lead the way from the former method of life. Kings presently began to build cities as a protection and refuge for themselves, and divided the herds and the fields among men on considerations of personal appearance, strength, and understanding (Lucretius 5.1105-1112). After the discovery of gold and the development of the concept of property, the kingship became associated with ambition—a dangerous situation (Lucretius 5.1113-1135). Lucretius' view of the kingship is quite different from the Stoic philosophic concept of the kingship. According to Lucretius (5. 1136-1147), the kings and their thrones were soon cast down, and, after a period of anarchy, magistrates and laws were adopted. Thenceforth crime was followed by punishment and the fear of punishment now began to haunt the wrong-doer (Lucretius 5.1148-1160). At this point, finally, arose fear of the gods (Lucretius 5. 1161-1193).

Two passages of Cicero should be considered as presenting a view in harmony with the Epicurean doctrine. (1) In his youthful rhetorical work *De Inventione* (1.2) Cicero traces the evolution of men from the bestial state through the first stages of development (stages marked by lack of insight and by error, as a result of which greed and avarice ravaged their bodily strength and they knew nothing of the expedience of equitable law) until they fell under the civiliz-

In dealing with these three themes I shall throughout give Stoic thought.

#### I. THE EVOLUTION OF KINGSHIP AND LAWS

(a) Posidonius the Stoic is reported by Athenaeus<sup>3</sup> as saying in the eleventh book of his 'Histories' that 'many men, not being able, on account of the weakness of their intellect, to take care of themselves, gave themselves into the service of wiser men in order that they might get from such wiser men care in the things that were necessary to life, and might themselves, on their own part, give back to these wiser men as their due whatever services they might themselves be able to perform'.

(b) Posidonius is also in all likelihood the source of many of the details about the Golden Age and about the evolution of sin which we find in Ovid and in Seneca, whether he is such source directly or through the *Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum* of Varro<sup>4</sup>. According to Ovid<sup>5</sup>, there were in the Golden Age fruit and herbs, but no blood to touch the lips. Birds, the hare, and the fish were unmolested by guile. But presently the taste of meat opened a path for crime, bringing in its wake impiety and cruelty to faithful animals, and the unsated hunger for forbidden food.

(c) Other details come from Seneca<sup>6</sup>. Common fellowship, he says, remained inviolate for a time, but was later distracted by greed (§ 4). The first mortals and their sons were uncorrupted; they followed the same leader and used the same laws, and submitted to the judgment of their superior. Inferiority and superiority have a natural justification (§ 4). The governing attribute of animals is strength, that of man is mind. Sovereignty, in the judgment of Posidonius, was in the hands of the wise (§ 5). Endowed with foresight, courage, and beneficence, the wise protected the weaker and pointed out the expedient and the inexpedient. The duty of the wise lay in the exercise of their superior capabilities. Since there was on their part no intent to injure, and no reason for injuring, they were obeyed, and the direst threat a king could utter against disobedient subjects was to bid them depart from his kingdom (§ 5). Later, when kingdoms were transformed into tyrannies, need arose for laws; those laws were devised by wise men (§ 6). The arts of daily life, the ingenious inventiveness which piles houses on houses and cities on cities were the creation of philosophy, according to Posidonius (§ 7). But, says Seneca (§ 8), 'Take my word for it, blessed was the age that preceded the advent of architects, of builders <*architecti, tectores*>'. Simple were the life and the needs of primitive man (§ 10). Seneca could not agree with Posidonius that wise men were the inventors of work in iron or the

influence of a great and wise man (the determining factor in the evolution is the presence or the absence of the element of *ratio animi*). This great and wise man, realizing the worth of the stuff of which men were made, and the possibilities for great achievements by men, gathered men together into one place, and introduced them to the expedient and the honorable, despite themselves at first, though men later gave more willing audience to his reason and his eloquence. (2) In *Pro Publio Sextio* Cicero again describes the ascent of man from a life governed, after the fashion of the beasts of the fields, by brute force, to one which, under the influence of men of singular worth and counsel, recognizes public interests, states, cities, and law.

<sup>3</sup>A. Schmeling, *Die Philosophie der Mittleren Stoia*, 288 (Berlin, Weidmann, 1892).

<sup>4</sup>Metamorphoses 15.96-142. <sup>5</sup>Epistulae Morales 90.

discoverers of iron or bronze (§§ 11-13). Such things as the hammer and the tongs were invented, he held, by some man whose mind was keen and alert, but not great or exalted.

(d) Tacitus pauses long enough (*Annales* 3.26) to portray his conception of the origin of civil institutions. He, too, begins with a life of innocence, free from corruption and guilt. In that day neither laws nor rewards were needed, for virtue came naturally. The absence of crime obviated the necessity of penalties. Presently ambition and violence began to trample on the rights of man, and led to unlimited monarchy. Some states, if not at first, at least soon after trial was made of kings, preferred government by law.

(e) Justinus, at the beginning of his 'Histories' (1.1), commits himself to the same view of things:

Principio rerum gentium nationumque imperium penes reges erat, quos ad fastigium huius maiestatis non ambitio popularis, sed spectata inter bonos moderatio provehebat. Populi nullis legibus tenebantur: [arbitria principium pro legibus erant]. . . .<sup>9a</sup>

## II. THE NATURE OF KINGSHIP

(a) That the Stoic conception of kingship (which followed immediately upon the nomadic life) is a philosophic one is attested by Chrysippus. He felt<sup>7</sup> that the wise should not only be free, but should also be kings; kingship is an absolute rule in the hands of the wise alone. He held further that the ruler must alone well discern the distinction between good and evil; the base man will not attain that conception.

(b) 'In the Golden Age' says Seneca<sup>8</sup>, 'sovereignty was, so Posidonius thinks, in the hands of the wise'.

(c) Cicero maintains that the wise man naturally would wish to administer the State, since he is born to protect and preserve men<sup>9</sup>.

(d) Cicero also affirms that to philosophy we owe the invention of laws<sup>10</sup>.

(e) Lucian, in the 'Sale of Lives'<sup>11</sup>, makes Mercury, who is trying to sell Chrysippus, describe thus his virtues: 'he alone is wise, he alone fair, he alone just, courageous, king, a *rhetor*, wealthy, and a law-giver'.

(f) Clement of Alexandria<sup>12</sup> maintains that the Stoic philosophers, in associating kingship with the wise man alone, hold tenets consonant with those of Plato and Speusippus.

Such are the sources which underlie a discussion of the kingship as an historical and philosophical institution. To the Stoic the kingship, as well as the law<sup>13</sup>, with which it is closely identified, had a natural justification for its existence. The king was a man endowed with moral integrity, earnestness, and foresight. He cham-

<sup>9a</sup>The sentence *arbitria... erant* is bracketed by Francis Ruehl, M. Juniani Iustini Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogii. . . (Leipzig, Teubner, 1915). C. K. >

<sup>10</sup>See Ioannes von Arnim, Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta, 3.617 (Leipzig, Teubner, 1923).

<sup>11</sup>Epistulae Morales 90.5.

<sup>12</sup>De Finibus 3.68. See von Arnim, 3.616 (compare note 7, above).

<sup>13</sup>Tusculanae Disputationes 5.6.

<sup>14</sup>Chapter 20. See von Arnim, 3.622 (see note 7, above).

<sup>15</sup>Clement of Alexandria, Stromata 2.19.3-4 (in the edition by Otto Stählin [Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1906]). See von Arnim, 3.619. For later references see *ibidem*, 615, 617, 618, 620.

<sup>16</sup>Compare Diogenes Laertius 7.128 φύσει τε τὸ δικαῖον εἶναι καὶ μὴ θέσει . . . , καθά φησι Χρύσιππος.

pioned the cause of justice and equity in law<sup>14</sup>. He fulfilled, according to Posidonius, the philanthropic mission of governing for the protection of men of lesser endowments. In requital for his services, care, and advice, he received such services as men of lesser endowments were able to render to him<sup>15</sup>. Sometimes, however, the origin of the kingship lay in the suppression of the multitude by those who had greater resources<sup>16</sup>. After the Golden Age, according to Tacitus, ambition and violence ushered in the rule of unlimited monarchs and kings<sup>17</sup>. Indeed, the historic kingship of Deioces over the Medes was preceded by a period of crime and violence<sup>18</sup>. In some cases at once, in others only after kingship had proved exceedingly irksome, some preferred to a régime of irresponsible will one based upon law<sup>19</sup>. But, on the other hand, Justinus presupposes no coup or lapse from virtue as introductory to the kingship, nor does Posidonius or Seneca. Polybius does not square precisely with Stoicism here, for he supposes a primitive stage of no social habits, and makes the kingship follow upon monarchy through impulses of family ties, ties of sociability, and companionship. Then for the first time mankind conceived notions of goodness and justice<sup>20</sup>.

## III. THE NATURE OF LAW

(a) With respect to the nature of law, Chrysippus, in his book 'On the Beautiful', declared<sup>21</sup> that justice, law, and right reasoning do not exist by convention, but have a basis in nature.

(b) Chrysippus, in his book 'On Law', said<sup>22</sup> that 'law is king of all affairs divine and human. It must be the champion of the beautiful, and of the base both master and guide, and so must be the measure of the just and the unjust. For beings by nature gregarious it must enjoin what is to be done, and forbid what is not to be done'.

(c) Cicero<sup>23</sup> particularly approved this point of view, that law has a natural basis of justification, both in itself and in contradistinction to *iniuria*<sup>24</sup>. Law has been defined further as the highest reasoning, inbred in nature, ordering what is to be done and prohibiting the contrary<sup>25</sup>. It is an eternal thing, designed to control the whole universe through its wisdom in ruling and prohibiting. It is the reasoning power of the wise man<sup>26</sup>. Laws were invented with a view to the welfare of citizens, the safety of states, and the quiet and happy

<sup>14</sup>Cicero, *De Officiis* 2.12 Nam cum premeretur in otio multum . . . ad unum aliquem configuebant virtute praestantem, qui cum prohiberet iniuria tenuiores, aequitate constituenda summos cum infimis pari iure retinebant.

<sup>15</sup>Athenaeus 263 C. <sup>16</sup>See note 14, above.

<sup>17</sup>Annales 3.26 At postquam exui aequalitas et pro modestia ac pudore ambitio et vis incedebat, provenerunt dominationes multosque apud populos aeternum mansere.

<sup>18</sup>Herodotus 1.97.

<sup>19</sup>Tacitus, *Annales* 3.26.3 Quidam statim, aut postquam regum pertaessum, leges maluerunt.

<sup>20</sup>6.5. <sup>21</sup>See Diogenes Laertius 7.128; von Arnim, 3.308.

<sup>22</sup>See von Arnim, 3.314.

<sup>23</sup>Cicero, *De Finibus* 3.71 Ius autem . . . esse natura (see von Arnim 3.309); *De Legibus* 1.28 neque opinione, sed natura constitutum esse ius (see von Arnim, 3.309, 343).

<sup>24</sup>Cicero, *De Legibus* 1.44 Ius et iniuria natura diiudicantur. Compare von Arnim, 3.311 (see note 7, above).

<sup>25</sup>Cicero, *De Legibus* 1.18 Lex est ratio summa, insita in natura, quae iubet ea quae facienda sunt prohibet contra. See von Arnim, 3.315.

<sup>26</sup>Cicero, *De Legibus* 2.8 Legem . . . esse . . . aeternum quiddam, quod universum mundum regeret imperandi prohibendique sapientia . . . est enim ratio mensque sapientis. See von Arnim, 3.316.

life of man. A state without law is to be counted as nothing.<sup>27</sup>

UNIVERSITY OF AKRON,  
AKRON, OHIO

ARTHUR M. YOUNG

### REVIEWS

The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition. By Charles Alexander Robinson, Jr. (Brown University Studies<sup>1</sup>). Providence: Brown University (1932). Pp. 81. \$3.00.

The story of Alexander's conquest of the Persian Empire is preserved for us most fully in the works of Arrian, Diodorus, Justinus, Curtius, and Plutarch. These historians based their accounts on various sources, most of which are now available to us only in scattered fragments. Two early works that greatly influenced the five later writers were the Ephemerides, the day by day record of Alexander's campaigns which was kept by Eumenes of Cardia and Diodotus of Erythrae, and the history written by Callisthenes of Olynthus, Alexander's official historian until 327. Callisthenes based his work on the Ephemerides.

The itinerary of Alexander as presented by each of the five later historians is closely examined by Professor Robinson in his monograph, *The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition*. In lists drawn up in parallel columns (14-62) he compares their individual versions. He believes that the itinerary falls into three divisions. In the first and the third divisions the five authors are, he says, in substantial agreement. In the second division there is much confusion in the accounts. Professor Robinson concludes that in divisions one and three the five authors ultimately had a common source, but that in division two they did not.

Since the first division ends in 327 B. C., Professor Robinson follows Professor W. K. Prentice<sup>2</sup> in assuming that the ultimate source of division one was Callisthenes. Professor Robinson suggests that the lack of unity in the second division was due to the loss of the Ephemerides when, according to Plutarch (Eumenes 2.2-3), the tent of Eumenes was destroyed by fire in 326. The period covered by division two (327-326 B. C.) corresponds roughly to the period between the death of Callisthenes and the firing of Eumenes's tent. It is shown very clearly (64-68) that the source of Arrian and Plutarch for the story of the last days of Alexander was dependent on the Ephemerides. Professor Robinson therefore assumes that the Ephemerides were available for the period from 326 to the death of Alexander, and so were the ultimate source for division three of the itinerary. He thus explains the agreement of the five authors in their accounts of this particular period.

<sup>1</sup>Cicero, *De Legibus* 2.11 Constat profecto ad salutem civium civitatumque incolumitatem vitamque hominum quietam et beatam inventas esse leges, 2.12 Lege autem carens civitas estne ob <id> ipsum habenda nullo loco? Dici aliter non potest. See von Arnim, 3.318.

<sup>2</sup>No number is attached to the volume. It is, apparently, Volume 1 or Number 1 of Brown University Studies <in Classics?>. C. K. >

<sup>3</sup>Professor Prentice set forth his views in an article entitled "Callisthenes, The Original Historian of Alexander," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 54 (1923), 73-85.

Mr. Tarn<sup>3</sup> declares that Plutarch's story about the destruction of Eumenes's tent is absurd. This is putting the matter rather strongly. It does not seem at all improbable that Eumenes's tent was fired and that a portion of the Ephemerides was destroyed. It is very unlikely that Eumenes had all the records with him. Copies, at least, of the records must have been sent back to Babylon or to Persepolis. It had been four full years since Alexander left Persepolis. Eumenes must surely have left the Ephemerides for 333-330 B. C. at Persepolis when Alexander started out in pursuit of Darius in the Spring of 330.

For the period of 333-327 Callisthenes was no doubt the ultimate source of the later historians. Even if the Ephemerides had been accessible, it is questionable if any one would have read them to gather material for a historical work relating to that period. The work of Callisthenes provided much more interesting reading, and, since it was known to be based on the Ephemerides, the ancient historians could, we may suppose, see no reason for struggling through the daily records, the Ephemerides. Even if the Ephemerides were not destroyed by the fire in Eumenes's tent, it would have been almost inevitable that the original records for the period covered by Callisthenes's history should disappear from sight, as did many other writings of antiquity for which there was no demand.

The Ephemerides for 326 to the death of Alexander are another matter. We can be sure that the records relating to Alexander's last days received attention. This is not, however, absolute proof that the Ephemerides relating to the return march from India also served as a source for later writers.

The question of the publication of the Ephemerides is still open<sup>4</sup>. Possibly they were published by Strattis of Olynthus, but Suidas's reference to Strattis might easily be interpreted to mean that Strattis wrote a work on the Ephemerides and five books on the death of Alexander, or that five books covered all that Strattis had to say about Alexander.

On the whole, Professor Robinson's monograph may be considered a real contribution to the study of the Ephemerides. His tabulations of the itinerary and of the accounts of the last days of Alexander will prove invaluable to those who are engaged in studying these sources. We shall look forward to the announcement of the "Alexander-harmony" which he hopes soon to supply (Preface, 7). This work will involve a discussion of the relative values of the authorities on whom the student of Alexander's life and work must rely.

The Appendix (74-81), entitled "When Did Alexander Reach the Hindu Kush?", has the merit of reopening this difficult chronological question, but Professor Robinson's solution does not seem to me entirely satisfactory, for reasons which I hope to set forth soon in a short note.

GOWANDA, NEW YORK

TOM B. JONES

<sup>3</sup>See *The Classical Review* 46 (1932), 216, <Professor Tarn makes this statement in the course of a brief, and not very favorable, review of Professor Robinson's monograph (216-217). C. K. >

<sup>4</sup>See Professor Robinson, *Ephemerides*, 72; W. W. Tarn, 216 (see note 3, above); Suidas, under Στράτης.

The Making of Geography. By R. E. Dickinson and O. J. R. Howarth (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, American Branch (1933). Pp. (x), 264. \$3.00<sup>1</sup>.

In the volume entitled *The Making of Geography*, by Messrs. Dickinson and Howarth, in compact and readable form is told the long and varied story of geographical progress from its beginnings in Sumeria and Egypt to the latest developments in physical and human geography. Inwoven in the story are accounts of the journeys of all the great travelers and explorers, from Thales, Pythagoras, and Hecataeus to Peary, Amundsen, and Scott. Each is considered in relation to the part he played in contributing to man's knowledge of the earth<sup>2</sup>. The illustrations consist of five Plates and thirty Cuts (in the text), which include famous maps, from the Sumerian World Map, on clay, of the early eighth century B. C., to Herbertson's "Natural Regions", published in 1905, views of the world's outline, from the distorted view on Schoner's globe (1523), to the almost perfect one of d'Anville (1761), and early astronomical and surveying instruments, from the Scaph of Aristarchus (of the third century B. C., the anticipator of Copernicus), to the Plane-table of Pretorius of Wittenberg (1590).

Ancient and medieval geography (including Moslem) is treated in the first six chapters. The statement (1) that the Assyrian kings were established at Asshur on the Tigris by about 2400 B. C. has since received remarkable confirmation through the discovery last February in the ruins of Khorsabad (Dur-Sharrukin) of a cuneiform tablet with lists of some ninety-five kings and their reigns from the twenty-third or twenty-fourth to the eighth century B. C.; only three or four of these were known before. It seems certain that the oldest world map, that of the Sumerians, was made in the early eighth century B. C. While the original must be much older, it could hardly illustrate (4) "the military operations of Sargon of Akkad (2700 B. C.)...." The date, about 1200 B. C., given (1) for the Exodus and the earliest Phoenician colonies on the coast of North Africa is too late. The date of the former event is in dispute. We know, however, that Sidon's first North African trad-

ing-post (Cambe, whose ruins are at Bordj-Jedid in Tunis) was founded in the sixteenth century B. C. The first Persian attempt to invade Greece under Mardonius in 492 B. C. is omitted (4). Alexander's conquest of Persia began in 334, not in 338 B. C. (2), and "the desolation of Iran...." (19) through which he returned from India should be identified with ancient Gedrosia, or the modern Mekran in Beluchistan. Alexander's fleet did not navigate the Arabian Sea; he died in Babylon in 323 B. C. just before the fleet was to sail under Nearchus. Greek Egypt lasted at most from 306 to 30 B. C., and therefore not for three and one-half centuries (23). However imperfect Pliny's geographical data may be in the three and one-half books of his *Historia Naturalis* (Books 2, §§ 154-248, 3, 4, 5) that are devoted to geography, they are important to us, and should not be characterized (31) as "poor stuff...." Christianity was not recognized as the State religion of Rome by Constantine in 324 (39), for it was Theodosius who, in 392, forbade all pagan worship as treasonable. The division of the Roman Empire between Valens and Valentinian in 364 (39) was merely administrative and unimportant. Only the later division, one between the sons of Theodosius in 395, proved permanent.

Chapter XV, on Alexander von Humboldt and Carl Ritter, the founders of modern geography, is particularly interesting. Here is discussed the significance of the year 1859, when their labors were finished. The *Cosmos* of the former appeared in 1845-1859, the *Erdkunde* of the latter in 1832-1859. These two works laid the foundations respectively of physical and human geography. In 1859 Darwin's *Origin of Species* also appeared. This work not only established evolution scientifically, but also necessitated a vital change in the geographical view-point by supplementing the earlier teleological interpretation by the casual. This had momentous consequences—the genetic interpretation of land-forms, the birth of geomorphology, and the doctrine of the distribution of man and his activities as determined by environment. All this led eventually to the final, twentieth-century stage, the study of man's relationship to his environment and the recognition that man is not its creature, but through conscious effort is ever trying to adjust himself to it. Out of the effort has arisen 'regional' geography or chorography (the name, though not the meaning, goes back to Ptolemy), a study initiated by the appearance in 1903 of the *Tableau de la Geographie de la France*, by Vidal de la Blache (234), and now "the heart" (142) and "the essential aim of modern geography...." (233).

A bibliography of five pages, arranged by chapters, and an inadequate index, of six pages, complete the work.

UNIVERSITY OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

#### CLASSICAL ARTICLES IN NON-CLASSICAL PERIODICALS

##### VII

The American Historical Review—July, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by Allen B. West, of Tenney Frank, Rome and Italy of the Republic (An Economic Sur-

<sup>1</sup>The Contents of the book are as follows: <Table of> Contents (vii); List of Illustrations in Text (ix); List of Plates (x); I, Geography in Early Civilization (1-7); II, Greek Philosophers and Historians (8-18); III, Alexander and the Foundation of Alexandria (19-27); IV, Strabo and Early Latin Writers (28-32); V, Ptolemy (33-38); VI, The Dark Age of Early Christian Teaching (39-48); VII, Moslem Geography (49-54); VIII, The Beginning of the Renaissance in European Geography (55-64); IX, The Missionaries to the East (65-70); X, Political Overseas (71-74); XI, The German School (1500-50) (75-80); XII, The Flemish School (1550-1650) (87-107); XIII, Measurement and Cartography (1650-1800) (108-123); XIV, Exploration and Cartography in the Nineteenth Century (124-137); XVI, Alexander von Humboldt and Carl Ritter (1800-60) (138-160); XVI, The Development of Physical Geography (161-191); XVII, The Development of Human Geography (192-218); XVIII, The Development of Biogeography (219-231); XIX, The Regional Concept (232-245); XX, Summary and Conclusion (246-253); Bibliography (254-258); Index (259-264). C. K.<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Mention may be made of a book entitled *The History of Exploration from the Earliest Times to the Present Day*, by Brigadier-General Sir Percy Sykes (New York, Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xiv, 374). Two chapters of this book may interest students of the Classics: I, Early Explorations (1-10), II, The Expedition of Alexander the Great (11-19).

Mention may be made, also, of two other recent works whose names occur to me, Harry E. Burton, *The Discovery of the Ancient World* (Harvard University Press, 1932. Pp. [xii], 130), and E. H. Warmington, *Greek Geography* (London, Dent, New York, Dutton, 1934. Pp. xlviii, 269. C. K.).

vey of Ancient Rome, Edited by Tenney Frank, Volume I); Short notice, favorable, by W. A. Heidel, of Abel Rey, *La Science dans l'Antiquité*, Tome II: *La Jeunesse de la Science Grecque*; Short notice, uncritical, by Allen B. West, of David M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus, Part VII: The Terra-cottas of Olynthus Found in 1931*; Short notice, qualifiedly favorable, by Donald McFayden, of Mason Hammond, *The Augustan Principate in Theory and Practice during the Julio-Claudian Period*; October, Review, unfavorable, by W. S. Ferguson, of Helmut Berve, *Griechische Geschichte, Zweite Hälfte: Von Perikles bis zur Politischen Auflösung*; Review, favorable, by A. E. R. Boak, of Jean-Rémy Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain: Contribution à l'Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État à la Fin du Quatrième Siècle*; Review, favorable, by A. E. R. Boak, of Jean-Rémy Palanque, *Essai sur la Préfecture du Prétoire du Bas-Empire*; Short notice, favorable, by Walter Woodburn Hyde, of R. E. Dickinson and O. J. R. Howarth, *The Making of Geography*; Short notice, generally unfavorably, by George A. Barton, of Herman Junker and Louis Delaporte, *Die Völker des Antiken Orients*; Short notice, uncritical, by C. A. Robinson, Jr., of Edward T. Newell, *The Fifth Dura Hoard*; Short notice, qualifiedly favorable, by T. F., of William Chase Greene, *The Achievement of Rome: A Chapter in Civilization*. The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures—July, *The Oriental Institute Archaeological Report on the Near East*, Prepared with the Co-operation of Professor James H. Breasted [this is the second report]; October, *The Oriental Institute Archaeological Report on the Near East*, Prepared with the Co-operation of Professor James H. Breasted [this is the third report. "We are striving for the greatest possible completeness and accuracy in these reports...."].

The American Political Science Review—October, Review, qualifiedly favorable, by George H. Sabine, of Robert J. Bonner, *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*.

Anglican Theological Review—July, Review, favorable, by Frederick C. Grant, of A. D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion* from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo; October, *Recent Text Studies in the New Testament*, Henry A. Sanders.

Annales de l'Université de Paris—Juillet-Août, Camille Jullian, *Jérôme Carcopino* [with a photograph of Camille Jullian. This is an obituary of Jullian, who died on December 12, 1933]; Review, or rather summary, unsigned, of Jean-Rémy Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain: Contribution à l'Histoire des Rapports de l'Église et de l'État à la Fin du Quatrième Siècle*; Review, favorable, unsigned, of Jean-Rémy Palanque, *Essai sur la Préfecture du Prétoire du Bas-Empire*.

The Atlantic Monthly—October, *The Original Language of the Gospels*, Edgar J. Goodspeed ["Of the Jewish Apocrypha written within a century of the life of Jesus, the great majority were composed in Greek, not Aramaic, and it seems abundantly clear that in the times of Jesus the Jews were not writing books

in Aramaic; indeed, they were actually resorting to the strangest devices to avoid doing so.... It has become clear that New Testament Greek is not a kind of ancient Yiddish, as some have supposed. The thousands of Greek papyrus documents from the very years of its origin have definitely established its right to be, and, against the protests of Classicists and Semitists, have recovered for it its rightful position, of which it had long been disinherited. The Gospels were written not in muddy Greek or an awkward patois. They were, rather, masterpieces of popular literature, the first books written in popular Greek.... And the New Testament will be best understood as the literary precipitate deposited by the Christian movement when it impinged upon the Greek world"].

Bibliotheca Sacra—July, Review, favorable, by E. F. Harrison, of Sir Charles Marston, *New Bible Evidence*.

The Bodleian Quarterly Record—3rd Quarter, 1934, *An Unknown Fifteenth-Century Version of the Iliad*, R. Weiss [this article covers less than a page. "MS. Can. Lat. 139 contains a Latin version of books I-XII of the *Iliad*.... it is the only version of a considerable part of the *Iliad* made between 1363 and 1440...."].

The Burlington Magazine—July, Review, very favorable, by C. F. C. H., of August Oxé, *Arretinische Reliefgefäße vom Rhein*; August, Review, favorable, by R. P. H., of Thomas Whittemore, *The Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul*; Review, unfavorable, by W. L., of *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (U. S. A., Providence: Museum of the Rhode Island School of Design, Fasc. I, Stephen Bleecker Luce); September, Review, favorable, by Egerton Beck, of C. Leonard Woolley, *Ur Excavations, Vol. II, The Royal Cemetery: A Report on the Predynastic and Sargonid Graves Excavated Between 1926 and 1931*; October, Review, or rather summary, by A. W. Clapham, of *La Conservation des Monuments d'Art et l'Histoire*.

The Catholic Historical Review—October, *A Thesis on Heredity*, Henri Hyvernat [this long review of Sir Flinders Petrie's *Seventy Years in Archaeology* is principally devoted to rebuking Sir Flinders Petrie for his "disparaging paragraphs" about the Directors of the Egyptian Service des Antiquités]; Review, favorable, by Martin R. P. McGuire, of Ulrich Wilcken, *Alexander the Great*.

The English Historical Review—October, Short notice, uncritical, by A. W. L., of D. M. Robinson, *Excavations at Olynthus, Part V, Mosaics, Vases and Lamps, Part VI; Coins, Part VII, Terracottas*.

The English Journal—October, To Abraham Cowley (A "Pindarique Ode"), Barbara Paton Smith.

The Expository Times—November, Short notice, favorable, unsigned, of G. C. Richards, *Concise Dictionary to the Vulgate New Testament*.

Golden Book Magazine—October, Demosthenes and Hiram Johnson Advocate a Bigger, Better Navy, unsigned.